



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Keiji KASHIMA

Group Art Unit: 2871

Application No.: 09/515,675

Examiner: T. Chowdhury

Filed: February 29, 2000

Docket No.: 101309.01

For: BACK LIGHT DEVICE WITH DIFFUSING SHEET FOR A LIQUID CRYSTAL
DISPLAY APPARATUS (AS AMENDED)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the September 30, 2003 Office Action, the period for reply being extended by the attached Petition for Extension of Time, reconsideration of the above identified application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,196 to Winston et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,126,882 to Oe et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,829,823 to Hou et al., claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Winston and Oe and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,369 to Yokota, claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Winston and Oe and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,793,456 to Broer et al. and claims 1, 4-6 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over WO 95/17692 to Ouderkirk et al. in

view of U.S. Patent No. 5,143,433 to Farrell, Winston, Oe and Hou. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action recognizes that the AAPA does not disclose the light outputting surface of the diffusing sheet is rougher than the face of the at least one light diffusing sheet and that Farrell does not explicitly disclose the light outputting surface of the diffuser is rougher than the face of the at least one light diffusing sheet as in the inventions of claims 2 and 6. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertion that Winston provides the deficiencies of AAPA, Ouderkirk and Farrell. Specifically, Winston discloses that by employing a diffuser having a rougher surface the uniformity of light is improved. However, improving the uniformity of light, i.e., leveling the intensity of the light, extremely weakens the maximum intensity of the diffused light and it becomes impossible to shift the direction of the maximum intensity of the diffused light. Therefore, improving the uniformity of light is different from shifting the direction of the maximum intensity of the diffused light toward the direction of normal standing, as in the inventions of claims 1 and 6.

The Office Action recognizes that AAPA does not disclose the light diffusing sheet having a haze value of 30% or more and that Ouderkirk and Farrell also do not disclose this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action assertion that Oe provides this feature. In Oe, the first element having the haze value of 30% is not a light diffusing sheet, as in the inventions of claims 1 and 6, but is instead a light conductor. See Oe at, e.g., col. 20, lines 22-50.


The Office Action recognizes that AAPA, Ouderkirk and Farrell do not disclose a light reflecting sheet having a diffusing reflectivity of 70 or more. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertion that Hou provides the deficiencies of AAPA, Ouderkirk and Farrell. In Hou the reflector 150 is used to reflect non-polarized light and not to reflect polarized light. Although the reflector has a reflectivity in a range of about 75 to

90% for non-polarized light, this does not mean that it has a reflectivity in the range of 75 to 90% for polarized light. Therefore, Hou fails to disclose a light reflecting sheet having reflectivity of 70 or more, as in the inventions of claims 1 and 6.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47,260

JAO:MQB/ale

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: March 30, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--